

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action dated September 19, 2005. A petition for a two-month extension of time is submitted herewith so that this amendment is timely filed.

Remarks on Amendments

The specification has been amended to eliminate the incorporation by reference of foreign applications, thus overcoming the objection in the Office Action. A typographical error noted during preparation of the amendment is also corrected. The claims are amended to increase their clarity and to correct formality errors. A substitute drawing for Fig. 4 is filed herewith to overcome the objection to the drawings.

Response to Double Patenting Rejection

In response to the double patenting rejection, applicants note that this is a provisional rejection, since neither of the cases involved is allowed or issued. When one of these applications issues, applicant will file a terminal disclaimer in the other case to the extent it is appropriate based on the claims finally allowed.

Response to Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 5-15 were rejected as anticipated by Wallach. Claims 1-15 were rejected as anticipated by Park et al. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 12-15 were rejected as anticipated by GB 2344745. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The three cited references disclose robotic vacuum cleaners with intakes, but the intakes are conventional, of a type typically used with hoses for surface cleaning. There is no suggestion in these references of a system that is adapted

for air cleaning rather than surface cleaning. Claim 1 is amended to recite “an air cleaning part disposed in the robot body, for drawing-in air from an open intake directed toward the atmosphere and located at a distance from any surface so as to draw air from the atmosphere rather than such surfaces, filtering the atmospheric air, and discharging cleaned air into the atmosphere....” Claim 14 is amended to recite an “air cleaning part operating to draw in air through an open intake directed toward the atmosphere and located at a distance from the surface such that the intake does not draw dust from the surface, and further operating to filter air and return it to the atmosphere....” Thus, claims 1 and 14 (as amended) recite a system that draws in atmospheric air from an *open* intake that is not directed toward a surface, filter the atmospheric air, and return it to the atmosphere. The cited references fail to disclose this concept, and actually teach away from this idea, by disclosing hoses attached to the intakes noted in the Office Action for the purpose of surface cleaning.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected as obvious based on the combination of GB ‘745 or Wallach and Song et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed. The Song patent merely discloses a driving mechanism. The addition of Song to the other references therefore does not disclose or suggest the claimed air cleaning system. Thus, these dependent claims are patentable in view of the patentability of claim 1, in addition to reciting further independently patentable features.

Remarks on Information Disclosure Statements

It is noted that the examiner reviewed three of the Information Disclosure Statements filed prior to the issuance of the Office Action, but did not review a fourth IDS, filed July 22, 2005. It appears that the fourth IDS crossed in the mail with the Office Action. When

considering this response, applicants request that the Examiner consider the fourth IDS, and a fifth IDS filed Feb. 1, 2006.


Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application into better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any shortage of fees, or credit any overpayment thereof, to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (116511-00127). In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to render this Amendment timely, and in the event that a separate petition either does not accompany this Amendment or is insufficient to render this Amendment timely, the Applicant hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this Amendment timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael C. Greenbaum
Registration No. 28,419
Attorney for Applicants

BLANK ROME, LLP
600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-2485
(202) 772-5800 (Phone)
(202) 772-5858 (Facsimile)